



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/524,447	10/13/2005	Lothar Stadelmeier	28271US8XPCT	6248

22850 7590 09/25/2009  
OBLON, SPIVAK, MCCLELLAND MAIER & NEUSTADT, L.L.P.  
1940 DUKE STREET  
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314

EXAMINER
----------

TORRES, MARCOS L

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2617

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-------------------	---------------

09/25/2009

ELECTRONIC

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

patentdocket@oblon.com  
oblonpat@oblon.com  
jgardner@oblon.com

### ADVISORY ACTION

1. Applicant's amendment to claim 7 introduces new limitations which were not previously considered, which requires further consideration.
2. Applicant's arguments filed 9-8-09 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.
3. Regarding applicant's representative [hereinafter applicant] arguments directed to the MPEP 707.07(f); no rejection was repeated since every rejection in the prior office action included new grounds of rejections.
4. Applicant asserts that Haartsen '297 fails to teach splitting a wireless ad hoc network, because the unit remains a member of the first Pico net. However, the examiner finds the argument not persuasive because the claims only require to split the wireless network and Haartsen discloses a wireless terminal which stop using a Pico net for a time out period and meanwhile creates and uses a new Pico net (see col. 6, lines 7-30), which can be properly equated to splitting a wireless ad hoc network. If the wireless terminal later on wants to return and resume communication that limitation is not restricted in the claim.
5. Applicant asserts that Haartsen '297 fails to teach a creation of a new Pico net. Please, see col. 6, lines 10-11, where Haartsen clearly recites "and establishes connections for a new piconet, designated piconet B".
6. Changing to the second reference Haartsen '372, applicant submits that in this reference there is no additional bandwidth is provided. As disclosed in the arguments Haartsen '372 reallocated the bandwidth in the network from some terminals to others

Art Unit: 2617

(see col. 1, lines 13-17; col. 5, lines 49-56; col. 7, lines 25-41), thereby for the terminal requesting the bandwidth additional bandwidth is provided.

7. In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., checking for a bandwidth overload) are not recited in the rejected claim(s).

Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

8. With respect to the third reference Schmidt, applicant recites that the reference fails to teach that the central controller check if the wireless terminal requires more bandwidth, as shown in the arguments by the applicant, the request of additional bandwidth is equated to the teaching that the central controller check if the wireless terminal requires more bandwidth. The Schmidt reference was not relied for the limitation of creating new networks; please see the references to the primary reference Haartsen '297.

9. Therefore, the combinations Haartsen '297, Haartsen '372 and Schmidt teach all the limitation as claimed.

10. Regarding the arguments directed to claim 2, the cited section of col. 5 and 6 of Haartsen '297 of the rejection of record relies on the creation of the Pico net rather than when the unit leaves Pico net.

11. As to claim 4, applicant asserts that Haartsen '297 fails to disclose that the connections to wireless terminals that cannot be interrupted are not interrupted. It is

Art Unit: 2617

noted that the claim merely require not moving the terminals, other interruptions may come.

12. For claim 5 applicant asserts that Haartsen '297 fails to teach a command to initiates a network change of the receiving unit; Haartsen '297 discloses sending a paging message to the slave unit to establish the new Pico net (see col. 6, lines7-30). As to the arguments directed to Haartsen '372, the rejection in record did relied on that reference, but Haartsen '297.

13. The arguments for claim 7 includes the new limitations which were not entered, thereby the arguments are moot.

/Marcos L Torres/

Examiner, Art Unit 2617